

Appendix F

Department of Health Survey of PIRT Stakeholders

- **Stakeholder Interviews PIRT Review Panel:
Recommendations for the PIRT Review Panel and
PIRT Annual Report**
- **Stakeholder groups and title of individual
interviewed**

Stakeholder Interviews

Recommendations for the PIRT Review Panel and PIRT Annual Report

Action Rank. Ordered by merit and feasibility:

- A. Improvements accepted and will be incorporated in the 2004 Annual Report.
- B. Suggestions for Agency action.
- C. Suggestions for PIRT to consider.

The number of times the recommendation was made is indicated in parentheses following the recommendations.

Recommendation	Action Rank	Response
Make the Report more timely. (8)	A	PIRT agencies are committed to make the Annual report more timely. Data for 2001 were reported in the 2003 annual report. PIRT will publish 2002 and 2003 data in the 2004 annual report and, in the future, has the goal of producing annual reports that report on the previous year's data. A second goal is to publish the report in the late fall in time for the legislative session.
Present cases so individuals can determine the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exact number of incidents and Which agencies overlapped on an incident. (4) 	A B1	The total number of overlapping cases was identified in the 2003 annual report. PIRT will continue to do this in future reports. (A) Effort will be made to list other PIRT agencies involved in agency summaries. (B1)
Notify the 10-15 major commodity associations/ news groups (good fruit grower, capitol press, etc.) when reports are out.	A	PIRT will prepare a press release and distribute it more widely. Press releases will be distributed to Hispanic radio stations in Spanish.
The Panel should be more pro-active regarding pesticide issues. (A)	A	PIRT is doing this through its annual Action Recommendations.
Give better foundation at the beginning of the report on the strengths and limitations of data. (3)	A	Panel agreed that this is a priority.
Make more use of trend data vs. Individual year data for different groups. (2)	A	Panel agreed that this is a priority.
Be consistent in reporting age, gender and race.	A	Incorporate into 2004 report.
Explain better the differences between PIMS and WSDA severity Classifications.	A	Incorporate into 2004 report.
Show in individual case summaries which agencies were involved.	B1	WSDA summaries indicate complaints referred to DOH. Agencies are encouraged to indicate all agencies involved in the agency summaries.

Recommendation	Action Rank	Response
In the narrative portion of the incident reports give more clarification as to what the person was doing when the exposure occurred.	B2	Each agency could address this issue.
Increase the reporting of ecologically related (spills and wildlife) incidents.	B3	This information is summarized in the Ecology agency report and more detail could be provided by case in the Ecology summary of events.
Indicate in case reports whether samples were taken and the results.	B4	WSDA already does this. DOH could look into providing the information in the PIRT narrative summary.
Break out the active ingredients by chemical class for reports. (2)	B5	DOH and WPC currently present some data on chemical class in the data summaries. This is not currently reported in the appendices for any agency. DOH will continue to report on chemical classes of interest. Other agencies are encouraged to do the same.
Present individual case summaries chronologically rather than by date of receipt.	B6	WSDA does this now. DOH could do it also.
Consider two versions of the individual incident reports, one with more specifics/details.	B7	Additional information in the printed report would make an already large report larger. Additional information could be accommodated in an on-line version of the PIRT annual report. The additional level of detail provided on each incident is an agency decision. PIRT could recommend that agencies provide supplemental information.
Place each agency's data on respective web sites in same the format so it could be more easily searched.	B8	This is an agency decision. PIRT could recommend it to the agencies.
Provide case data on-line for access by researchers. (2)	B9	This is an agency decision. PIRT could choose to recommend it to the agencies.
Broaden the documentation information on cases by including information documented from other studies and exposures (peer vs. non-peer reviewed).	B10	This type of broader documentation is typical of the "discussion" section of published studies. Currently it is not required for the PIRT report but agencies could opt to add a discussion to their data summary.
Where DOH finds a case to be Definite and WSDA shows no violation occurred give more explanation as to how the incident occurred. This may show that label changes are needed.	C1	Consider an annual analysis of DOH definite, probable, and possible cases investigated by enforcement agencies (both WSDA and WISHA) to see what we can learn from the joint investigations.

Recommendation	Action Rank	Response
Present incident data by commodity groups.	C2	DOH and WSDA currently use common chemical names in their case descriptions (Appendices). L&I Inspections list pesticides by trade name. PIRT could consider recommending that L&I WISHA data be reported by common name for consistency.
Use common chemical names.	C3	DOH and WSDA currently use common chemical names in their case descriptions (Appendices). L&I Inspections list pesticides by trade name. PIRT could consider recommending that L&I WISHA data be reported by common name for consistency.
Compare the number of PIMS cases classified DPP with the L&I claims that were rejected and with clarification as to why.	C4	Do for a sample.
Publish data from PIRT Annual Report more widely than just the PIRT report.	C5	Obtain suggestions on where.
Show incident data by licensed vs. non-licensed applicator and types.	C6	Is this of general enough interest to include in annual report?
Show a sample of cases that were found to be Definite, Probable or Possible (DPP) by PIMS that shows time/date of when each agency became involved with the incident.	C7	The agency interactions were described in the 2003 annual report. A sample of cases could be included as described.
Provide more in-depth minutes of the PIRT meetings.	C8	The minutes currently meet Panel requirements. PIRT could survey their interested party list to see if this is a priority need among PIRT stakeholders.
Provide an alphabetical index at end of report. (2)	C9	This would be very time consuming. It is possible.
Increase the attractiveness of the format of the PIRT Report.	C10	PIRT will consider options but must recognize budget limitations.
Broaden the membership of the PIRT Review Panel to include industry.	C11	Requires change in RCW 70.104.080 and support of the agencies to pursue legislative action.
Provide discussion of chronic health effects, which are not presently discussed in the report.	C12	Outside of PIRT mandate. Additional resources would be required to adequately address these issues. Discuss acute episodes that could lead to chronic effects.

Stakeholder groups and title of individual interviewed.

Agricultural Grower Representatives

Washington Growers League / Executive Director
Washington Hop Growers / Administrator
Washington State Farm Bureau / Safety Director
Washington State Pest Control Commission / Director
Washington Friends of Farm and Forest / Executive Director

County Health Departments

Grant County Health District / Director of Environmental Health
Public Health Seattle King County / Mgr. Hazardous Waste Program
Thurston county Health District / Supervisor, Hazardous and Solid Waste Program
Yakima County Health District / Supervisor, Solid Waste/Chemical& Physical Hazards

Environmental Groups

Washington Toxics Coalition / Pesticide Staff Scientist
Northwest Coalition Alternatives to Pesticides / Researcher

Farm Worker Representatives

Columbia Legal Services / Advocacy Coordinator
United Farm Workers of America / Regional Director
Farm Worker Pesticide Project / Executive Director (A non-profit organization on promoting pesticide reforms on behalf of farm workers)

Governmental Agencies

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health / Coordinator, Pesticide Illness and Injury Surveillance
U.S. EPA Pesticide Program / Health Statistician
U.S. EPA Region X / Worker Protection Standard Coordinator
Washington State Department of Agriculture / Mgr. Certification and Training

Health Care Providers

Columbia Valley Community Health Center / Medical Director
Mattawa Community Health Center / Physician
Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic, Toppenish / Physician

Non-Agricultural Applicators

Washington State Pest Control Assn. / Executive Secretary
International Pesticide Applicators / Washington Tree Service, Mgr.

Universities (Outreach and Prevention)

Washington State University Cooperative Extension / Grant County Area Extension Educator
Washington State University Cooperative Extension / Pesticide Education Coordinator
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center / Community Intervention Investigator “For Healthy Kids!” project
Eastern Washington University Center for Farm Health & Safety / Project Coordinator

Universities (Research)

University of Washington / Professor of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, Industrial Hygiene & Safety Program
Director, Pacific NW Center for Agricultural Safety and Health Center, University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine / Professor of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, Toxicology Program / PIRT Member and Toxicologist
Washington State University Food & Environmental Quality Lab / Researcher

Others

Washington Poison Control Center / RN (Certified Poison Information Specialist)
Work Group on Pesticide Safety and Health / Director and PIRT Member

Additional Interviews conducted by Office of Environmental Health and Safety Staff

Washington State Senate Republican Caucus /Staff
Washington State Senate Agriculture Committee /Staff
University of Washington, Environmental & Occupational Health Sciences / Manager
University of California, Davis / Staff Research Associate
University of California, Davis / Pesticide Safety Educator
University of California, Davis / Environmental Toxicology / Research Assistant
University of California, Davis / Pesticide Training Coordinator
University of California, Davis / Pesticide Safety Educator
California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment / Toxicologist
California Department of Pesticide Regulation, Worker Safety & Health / Branch Chief
University of California, Davis / Area IPM Advisor
California Department of Food and Agriculture / Inspector-Biologist
NIOSH, Program Analyst
University of Washington, Graduate Student
University of Hawaii, IPM Pesticide Risk Reduction and Safety Training Coordinator
National Farm Medicine Center, Wisconsin / Medical Director
Zenith Insurance Company / Director for Safety and Health